



"Rosenthal, Amy"
<amy.rosenthal@urs.com>
02/05/2012 11:58 AM

To ArcticAR <arcticar@urscorp.com>
cc
bcc
Subject FW: Fw: Reminder: Review of NMFS Arctic EIS Chapters 1-2

From: Candace Nachman [mailto:Candace.Nachman@noaa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 11:56 AM
To: Amy_Rosenthal@URSCorp.com
Subject: Re: Fw: Reminder: Review of NMFS Arctic EIS Chapters 1-2

Basically what should be reflected in the schedule is that after you incorporate comments on the print-ready version, it goes to be printed. Then put in a line to have the hard copies delivered to EPA (this needs to occur no less than one week prior to publication of the NOA in the FR). The EPA publishes a list of all EISs that are now out for public comment in the FR every Friday. They must receive the document no later than the Friday prior. However, before we can give it to EPA, we need to have mailed out the copies (hard version or electronic) to everyone who requested it and others as needed. Once you send me the revised schedule, I can correct this if necessary.

It would be good if we can get rid of GPO since it takes way too long. We can put out a feeler for how many people would want hard copies vs. electronic.

I will talk to Jolie tomorrow about a time when she and I can meet to discuss significance criteria so that you have what you need by May 5.

Thanks,
Candace

Amy_Rosenthal@URSCorp.com wrote:

Excellent! So I should put a line in the schedule before the NOA is published (by one week prior) for the DEIS to go to EPA... is that correct?

As of now we have not yet gotten rid of GPO. We discussed on the phone call that we need to figure out a way around the ridiculous printing timeline, and we (URS) were going to investigate options (in terms of page number restrictions, if we can [due to federal contracting requirements] go outside of GPO, and what it would cost to do so). So, the plan is to hopefully work around the GPO issue, but as of now, I'm still keeping them in the schedule (as sort of a "worst case" scenario).

One thing you guys were going to look into was compiling a list of exactly who would need hard copies (communities, libraries, etc.) and how many they would need so we could start estimating the printing need when we investigate GPO options.

Re. your other email about significance criteria - our authors are scheduled to begin work on Chapter 4 on 5/5. So my thought is that we'd need it finalized by earlier that week so we have an opportunity to meet with them all again and explain the process and methodology for the analysis. Thoughts?

-A-

~~~~~  
Amy C. Rosenthal (Lewis)  
Environmental Planner  
URS Corporation

503-948-7223 (direct phone)  
503-222-4292 (fax)

This e-mail and any attachments contain URS Corporation confidential information that may be proprietary or privileged. If you receive this message in error, please notify the sender immediately. If you are not the intended recipient, you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake. If you are not the intended recipient, you should destroy the e-mail and any attachments or copies.

Candace Nachman <[Candace.Nachman@noaa.gov](mailto:Candace.Nachman@noaa.gov)>

04/21/2011 11:26 AM

To [Amy\\_Rosenthal@URSCorp.com](mailto:Amy_Rosenthal@URSCorp.com)

cc [Jolie.Harrison@noaa.gov](mailto:Jolie.Harrison@noaa.gov)

SubjectRe: Fw: Reminder: Review of NMFS Arctic EIS Chapters 1-2

Amy,

It was my intention to have EPA (the people that we are working with now) review the draft and final EISs before they publish at the same time the cooperating agencies and NMFS GCF/PPI/NEPA review it. In my mind, I am treating them like a cooperating agency. Therefore, we can definitely get rid of the separate review and incorporating comments piece from the schedule you sent earlier this week. We just need to build in the one week that it goes to EPA prior to publishing in the FR for public comment. Also, I understand that we are going to get rid of the GPO printing, which saves us almost 12 weeks overall. To me, it would seem that more people would want electronic copies than hard copies. Therefore, I'm guessing we'll need to produce more CD copies than paper copies.

Once you think you have something pretty final, you can send it to me, and I can tweak it if you want. I'm here the rest of today and tomorrow.

Thanks,  
Candace

[Amy\\_Rosenthal@URSCorp.com](mailto:Amy_Rosenthal@URSCorp.com) wrote:

Hey guys - I'm still monkeying with the schedule and was investigating the EPA review times with Jennifer. As she notes below, she'd like the opportunity to review the preliminary draft EIS instead of a "print ready" version. Would it be OK to add them to the list of people (BOEMRE, NSB, NMFS GCF/PPI/NEPA) that are reviewing the preliminary draft in early July?

-A-

----- Forwarded by Amy Rosenthal/Anchorage/URSCorp on 04/21/2011 11:03 AM -----

[Curtis.Jennifer@epa.gov](mailto:Curtis.Jennifer@epa.gov)

04/21/2011 10:52 AM

To: [Amy\\_Rosenthal@URSCorp.com](mailto:Amy_Rosenthal@URSCorp.com)  
cc  
Subject: Re: Reminder: Review of NMFS Arctic EIS Chapters 1-2

I am sorry I didn't get a chance to meet you the other day. John Issacs had mentioned a while back (perhaps at Open Water?) that URS was going to be working on this project.

There is no requirement for EPA to review the "draft" draft EIS or "draft" final EIS prior to publishing, but if the lead/cooperating agency would like us to do so, we will do our best to accommodate. Depending on my workload, I usually need a minimum of two weeks to do an informal review or an EIS. If it is the print ready version, however, and there is no intention to incorporate our comments prior to publishing, I don't know if there is really a point to me doing this review, particularly since we are required to do a formal review of the published draft and final EIS anyway. I would much prefer to have the opportunity to review a "final" preliminary draft EIS and offer comments at that stage (which I think is what we are doing with Chps. 1 and 2), when our comments can be reviewed and hopefully incorporated into the document.

---

Jennifer Curtis, NEPA Reviewer/Compliance Coordinator  
US EPA-Alaska Operations Office  
222 West 7th Ave., #19  
Anchorage, AK 99513  
Phone: 907-271-6324  
Fax: 907-271-3424  
Email: [curtis.jennifer@epa.gov](mailto:curtis.jennifer@epa.gov)

From: [Amy\\_Rosenthal@URSCorp.com](mailto:Amy_Rosenthal@URSCorp.com)  
To: Jennifer Curtis/R10/USEPA/US@EPA  
Date: 04/21/2011 09:35 AM  
Subject: Re: Reminder: Review of NMFS Arctic EIS Chapters 1-2

Hi Jennifer -

I was actually in the Izembek Wetlands meeting with you earlier this week... I wanted to get a chance to introduce myself, but you all had to duck out early. Anyway, along with working on the Izembek project, I'm also the PM for the Arctic EIS.

I have a fairly random question for you, that hopefully you can help me with. I'm trying to adjust the Arctic EIS project schedule to get us to a ROD by June 2012. Right now, I have a separate line for an EPA review of the print-ready Draft EIS prior to publishing the NOA. Do you know how far in advance you need to have this review (i.e. prior to the document going to GPO for printing... or just a few days before the NOA comes out), and also if there is a requirement for how long the review should be?

I also have this same line item review built into the Final EIS...

Any help/guidance would be appreciated!  
Thanks,

Amy

~~~~~  
Amy C. Rosenthal (Lewis)
Environmental Planner
URS Corporation

503-948-7223 (direct phone)
503-222-4292 (fax)

This e-mail and any attachments contain URS Corporation confidential information that may be proprietary or privileged. If you receive this message in error or are not the intended recipient, you should not retain, distribute, disclose or use any of this information and you should destroy the e-mail and any attachments or copies.

Curtis.Jennifer
@epa.gov

04/21/2011
10:12 AM

To
Candace Nachman <Candace.Nachman@noaa.gov>
cc
Amy_Rosenthal@URSCorp.com,
Soderlund.Dianne@epamail.epa.gov,
Shaw.Hanh@epa.gov

Subject
Re: Reminder: Review of NMFS Arctic EIS
Chapters 1-2

We're on it! Thanks for the reminder Candace.

Jennifer Curtis, NEPA Reviewer/Compliance Coordinator
US EPA-Alaska Operations Office
222 West 7th Ave., #19
Anchorage, AK 99513
Phone: 907-271-6324
Fax: 907-271-3424
Email: curtis.jennifer@epa.gov

From: Candace Nachman <Candace.Nachman@noaa.gov>
To: Hanh Shaw/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Jennifer
Curtis/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Dianne Soderlund/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Amy.Rosenthal@URSCorp.com
Date: 04/21/2011 08:29 AM
Subject: Reminder: Review of NMFS Arctic EIS Chapters
1-2

Hi,

This is just a friendly reminder to please submit your comments on the first two chapters of the Arctic EIS to me by next Friday. There are some additional details in my original email below.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns.

Thanks,
Candace

Candace Nachman wrote:

Dear Hanh, Jennifer, and Dianne,

Thank you again for our conference call the other week. I think it was very useful and helpful in guiding us in our understanding of discharges in the Arctic. You will see that we have tried to capture the points of our discussion in Chapter 2. We have decided that it is too difficult to have an alternative carried through for full analysis that deals with discharges. Instead, we have described it in the Alternatives Considered But Dismissed From Further Consideration section and then worked it into the additional mitigation measures piece of the alternatives that are carried forward for full analysis. We would like to focus on those discharges that have been linked to potential impacts on

marine mammals and their habitat. It would be very helpful to us if you provided feedback on the pieces specific to discharge (along with your review of the rest of the documents).

I have attached both Chapters 1 and 2 to this email for your review and comment. It would be most helpful to have your comments in track changes. Also, actual suggested track changed language or text is more helpful than comment bubbles, but please use the comment bubbles for explanation as needed. Also, I would appreciate one set of comments from the EPA.

Please submit your comments to me by Friday, April 29. I will then compile them and send to URS.

Feel free to contact me with any specific questions or concerns.

Thanks,
Candace

--

Candace Nachman
Fishery Biologist

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Protected Resources
Permits, Conservation and Education Division
1315 East West Highway, Rm 3503
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Ph: (301) 713-2289 ext. 156
Fax: (301) 713-0376

Web: <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/>

--

Candace Nachman
Fishery Biologist

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Protected Resources
Permits, Conservation and Education Division
1315 East West Highway, Rm 3503
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Ph: (301) 713-2289 ext. 156
Fax: (301) 713-0376

Web: <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/>

--

Candace Nachman
Fishery Biologist

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration